Clauses 1 to 5.

The question that Clauses 1 to 5 do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carrie .

The Clauses were added to the Bill.

PREAMBLE AND TITLE.

The question that the Preamble and Title of the Bill do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Preamble and Title were added to the Bill.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar: I beg to move that the Bill be passed.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I second it

The motion was put to vote and carried.

The Bill was passed.

THE TRAVANCORE KRISHNANVAKA MARUMAKKATHAYAM BILL.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Sir, I rise to introduce the Travancore Krishnanvaka Marumakkathayam Bill.

Sir, it is nearly 14 years now since the major communities in the State that were having the Marumakkathayam system for their inheritance got Regulations enacted bringing about drastic changes in the law of succession, inheritance, marriage and its dissolution, and, more important than all, the partition of property. I do not propose to discuss here the principle of the Marumakkathayam system and its origin. It is now accepted on all hands that that is an antiquated system not suited to the present times. On account of the tightening of the marriage tie in these communities also, natural affection has turned towards ones' own issues from those of one's sisters'. It was this idea which prevailed upon the Legislature when it enacted the Nayar Regulation, the Ezhava Regulation, the Nanjinad Vellala Regulation, and the other Regulations on the lines of the Nayar Regulation.

Now, Sir, the Krishnanvaka Marumakkathayam community, although only a minority community, has been expressing its desire that it should also be given the benefit of provisions similar to those of the Nayar Regulation, and that they alone should not be put to the hardship of following the antiquated and unnatural system of Marumakkathayam, under which, even in very rich families, the Karanavan alone monopolised the whole property leaving very little to be enjoyed by the various members of the family. Sir, it is this that has been responsible for the Marumakkathayam law being substituted by enactments like the Nayar Regulation.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. R. Elenkath.]

Sir, once we provide for partition of tarwad property, it automatically follows that there should be the tightening of the marriage tie; and hence it is that in all these recent enactments governing the Marumakkathayam communities, the dissolution of marriage is made more and more difficult. Unless there is such tightening of the marriage tie, it would not be fair to give away his share to every member of a family, at the same time allowing him full right of disposal of such share of the property.

Sir, bearing in view all these points, the present Bill has been drawn up. The only deviation I have endeavoured to make is to fix the exact date on which the share of a person claiming partition is to be calculated. In other words, I have attempted to fix the exact time when a member of a family can claim partition. Sir, this change was necessitated by our experience of the actual working of the Nayar Regulation. Sir, when a suit for partition is filed, it should be made a definite rule that only the members actually in existence at the time of such suit, or notice of suit, who would be entitled to their *per capita* share of the family property. There should be no room for the tendency on the part of any member of the family to delay the partition. As it is, when a member moves for partition, there is procrastination in the actual effecting of the partition, because there is absolutely no definiteness as to the number of shares into which the family property is to be divided. Certainly if by delaying the partition a particular member stands to get for himself, or his branch of the family, a greater share of the family property, he would do everything in his power to put off the partition. Especially in the female line, knowing full well that the greater the number of children that a female member has the greater would be her share of the family property, interested parties will surely act as a hindrance to the partition being effected, and put all sorts of obstacles in the way. The moment a member sues for partition it should be made definite as to the number of shares into which the family property would be divisible. Then, of course, there would be no purpose served in any body delaying the partition indefinitely. It is with that object in view that I have made the provisions in sub-clauses (*b*) and (*c*) of Clause 39.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar: May I know from the member the trend of the rulings of our High Court in suits for partition of Nayar families? Is the number of shares to be fixed on the basis of the number of members existing on the date of suit, or on the date of decree?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. R. Elenkath : The rulings are conflicting, and are not clear. In a full Bench decision Mr. Changanacherry Parameswaran Pillai, J., has expressed strongly that the actual effecting of partition should not be delayed on any account, and that the divided status and the individual share should be fixed as on the date of notice of partition.

The trend of the opinion of the Nayar Community, if the member wants to know that, is that, the date on which the partition is sought for should be judged as the criterion for sharing the properties *per capita*, because it would be of no good to any one to allow the members to increase and wait for an indefinite time when all these members can come to an agreement and effect a partition. The object of this legislation is to bring about as far as possible a decrease in litigation and to prevent from hindering the benefit of law from being given to the members of this community.

With these words I move the Bill.

Mr. James Fletcher (*Kalkulam and Vilavankod* cum *Neyyattinkara*) : Sir, I second this Bill and support it on these reasons. This Krishnanvaka people are living mostly in South Travancore. They are a very enterprising community having mostly trade and agriculture for their profession. Ordinarily, they have got properties and a settled law regarding the disposition of their properties is necessary.

Mr. M. Govindan (*Nominated*) : May I know the population of this Krishnanvaka community for whom the proposed legislation is brought forward ?

Mr. James Fletcher : I think it will be about a lakh and a half.

Mr. M. Govindan : Does the member mean 15,000 ? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. James Fletcher : Sir, I am subject to correction.

President : There is a slight defference (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi : May I ask the member whether he means only four thousand ?

President : Order, order. The honourable member will proceed.

Mr. James Fletcher: Sir, I am not concerned with the number. I may state that they are a very enterprising community in South Travancore and as I submitted already, they are people having much landed estate in their possession. They naturally require some definite, and clear Regulation to effect the division of their properties. Till now they were following various systems with regard to the partition of their properties. Some people were following Makkathayam system of inheritance and others Marumakkathayam system, so much so there was always some difficul y an

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. James Fletcher.]

confusion in the disposition of their properties. Much unnecessary litigation had to be carried on for the sake of division of their property and also questions of inheritance arose which brought about much loss and damage to the community. Therefore, a Bill of this sort is highly necessary, which will settle their system of inheritance and make matters easy for them to divide their ancestral properties. Therefore, I support this Bill. Though the population may be small, yet they need some law regulating the question of marriage succession and partition among the members of the community. I may say that even if the number is much less than a lakh and a half the Bill as is introduced now is necessary.

Mr. A Easwara Pillai (*Co-opted*) : Sir, I wish to make a few observations on the Bill before the House.

Sir, the Bill sought to be introduced by Mr. Elenkath affects the community known as the Krishnanvaka community. Though the population is only 12,032 according to the last Census and 9,684 according to the previous Census, it was referred to by one of the honourable members as a lakh and a half. I think the honourable member may not be aware of the fact that the population is limited to 12,032 only according to the last Census.

Mr. M. S. Anirudhan : May I know whether there are Makkathayees ?

Mr. A Easwara Pillai: Sir, I shall refer to that. When I said that the community consists of 12,032 members, I meant the community known by the name Krishnanvaka which includes the two sections, one following the Hindu Mithakshara Law and known as Makkathayees and the other following the Marumakkathayam Law of the State and are known as Marumakkathayees. The Marumakkathayees number a little more than one thousand. So, what I beg to state is that this Bill refers to about a 1000 Krishnanvaka Marumakkathayees of this State, that is about a twelfth of the total population of the Krishnanvaka community. This is a social legislation and the honourable members may consider whether a social Bill which affects about a thousand of the Krishnanvaka community is quite necessary. Leave has been granted and the Bill is sought to be introduced. Sir, this Bill when passed or when it becomes law it will affect the community as a whole. It is referred to in the latest Census Report by the learned Census Commissioner Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.

President : I should like to know from Mr. Easwara Pillai whether he is opposing the motion or supporting it.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai : Sir, I am placing a few facts for the consideration of this House and if necessary to oppose the introduction of this Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. S. Anirudhan: May I know whether the member belongs to the Makkathayam or Marumakkathayam group?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Sir, I belong to the Makkathayam group.

President: Yes, the honourable member will proceed.

Mr A. Easwara Pillai: Sir, in the latest Census Report there is a reference made to the exact position of the two sections of the community. I shall refer to a sentence in that report. It reads thus:

> "There is a move on the part of the younger generation of the two sections to bring about a fusion between them."

Sir, that is the actual state of affairs in the community. If the Bill comes into Law, the Marumakkathayam section will have no possibility of a fusion which is being tried by the younger generation of the community. The population is only twelve thousand and even among the one thousand Marumakkathayees there are a large number who does not like such a Bill.

Mr. K. R Elenkath: May I know from the member whether this legislation which is more akin to Makkathayam Law will not help the fusion?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: In my opinion, for a few people a Marumakkathayam Law just similar to the Nayar Regulation is not necessary. But another Bill which is more comprehensive and may include the Makkathayees as well as the Marumakkathayees may help fusion to a considerable extent. This piece of legislation does not help fusion; but on the other hand, it separates and affects a cleavage between sections.

Mr. James Fletcher: May I know whether the member is aware of the facts that the Nayar Regulation more or less converted the Marumakkathayam system into a Makkathayam system.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Yes; I was saying that a similar system is not necessary in this case. A law affecting the Makkathayees as well as the Marumakkathayees will be more acceptable than the one that is now introduced, because this Bill makes a lot of difference between the two Sections of the Community.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar: May I know whether there is any move on the part of the Makkathayees to change the questions of inheritance?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: There is no move actually on the part of the Makkaathayees. But, when they were referred to it was their opinion that the solidarity of the Community would not be severed by such a new legislation.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: May I know whether inter-marriage and inter dining take place between these two sections.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: No, there is no inter-marriage and inter-dining between them in the strict sense of the term.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Whether the member.....

President: Order, order; I may make mention to the honourable members that his trend of thought need not be interrupted. He may be allowed to proceed and honourable members may put questions after he has sat down.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: What I was stating was that the solidarity of the community will be destroyed if this Bill is introduced because one section of it, I mean, the one thousand will not have any connection with the others who follow Makkathayam.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: May know what connection exists between them at present?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: They have a common name and common descent.

Mr. Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair: Excepting this common name, may I know whether there is any other bond of unity between these two sections?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I may request the honourable members to refer to the Census Report, when in it is stated that they are one and the same community being originally Makkathayees. I shall for that purpose read one or two sentennces.....

Mr. Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair: May I know whether there are any bond of union excepting this common name.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Yes; they are of the same family. That is what I say.

Mr. Kochickal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: May I know whether he considers the last Census Report as the authority on this question?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Yes; my observation was based on this report in consideration of previous reports and the present position of the community.

Mr. Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair: May I know whether any attempt at fusion was made between the two sections after the Census Report?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Even while the Census Report was in preparation and after, there was actual attempt made for this fusion.

Mr. Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair: May I know when was this report published?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Some ten or twelve years ago, (*Laughter.*)

President: The honourable member will proceed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai : Sir, I mean, it was published eight years ago.

Mr. Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair : May I know how far that trial has fructified ?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai : I may assure the honourable member that since the community is not so educated such changes can only take place very gradually. My friend who comes from a progressive community cannot aspire to have immediate changes brought about in a community where the education is not so advanced among its members.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai : May I know whether the Marumakkathayam Krishnanvaka Community is in favour of any legislation for them ?

Mr. A Easwara Pillai : There are ever so many legislations and as they are the loyal subjects of this State they are in favour them

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai : I want to know whether there are any social legislation affecting inheritance?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Yes. Truly we wish to have a legislation affecting the whole community including the Makkathayees and the Marumakkathayees.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath : May I know———

President : Order, order. I would deprecate such constant interruptions. The honourable member can note down the question and when the speaker has concluded, he can put those questions him. I don't want the honourable member to interrupt the continuity of thought and exposition of the speaker.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai : Sir, I was saying that this House should consider whether a Bill which affects only a limited number that is to say about a thousand people who belong to the Krishnanvaka community is absolutely necessary at this juncture Sir, these families who comprise this small section were following the Marumakkathayam system. There were no difficulties whatsoever with regard to partition, marriage or any other functions pertaining to that system. Therefore I don't see any necessity to have a separate legislation for this small community. But if it is absolutely necessary, a law may be introduced. But I doubt whether there is actually any necessity for a Bill of this kind. Moreover this Bill if it becomes law may affect the fusion that is sought to be affected by the younger generation of the community. Therefore I oppose the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath : May I know whether the same law is followed by the Makkathayees and Marumakkathayees of the Krishnanvaka community ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Sir, I was explaining to the House that the total number of the community comes to twelve thousand and about eleven thousand of them follow Makkathayam. And about one thousand follow the Marumakkathayam system now.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Is it not good to have the minority served by a separate law?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: If it could help the fusion of the minority section of the community as tried by the younger generation.

Mr. M. Govindan: Sir, I rise to oppose the motion of my honourable friend Mr. Elenkath. Sir, a new law is proposed to be introduced for a community numbering less than a thousand according to my friend who belongs to a very kindred community.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I was referring that it is not less than thousand, but a little above thousand.

Mr. M. Govindan: Well, let it be a little above thousand and I thank my honourable friend for the correction. Let us suppose that a family consists of 50 members who form a tarward. Then it would work up about 20 tarwards which are affected by this legislation. And then again about 50 per cent. of these tarwards would possess properties. That is ten tarwards will only be practically affected by this bill. My honourable friend who unfortunately belongs to the kindred community is a follower of the Makkathayam system. I am sorry that in this House there is no one to represent the Marumakkathayam section of the community which is sought to be affected by the introduction of this bill.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: Sir, is the member in order in referring to the constitution of the House?

President: He can lament the absence of a representative.

Mr. M. Govindan: The honourable member Mr. Easwara Pillai himself is not certain whether the bill is not wanted.

President: The honourable member cannot make remarks in that manner because Mr. Easwara Pillai concluded his speech by opposing it.

Mr. M. Govindan: Sir, in Travancore we have got for almost every numerically important community, separate legislations. We have got six or seven such separate legislations in our Statute Book. All the minority communities are also getting separate pieces of legislation for them. So my submission is if such communities as the Krishnanvaka which are numerically very small are to be given separate legislations, then administration of justice will not be easy as the various subtle differences of law enjoined by different communities make complications. Sir, my friend Mr. Elenkath said that the community wants a legislation very similar to that of Nairs. If they want an exactly the same legislation pertaining to Nairs, why not have them by adding small amendments to the Nair Regulation itself and include these Krishnavakais in the Nair community.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: May I know whether it will not affect the claim of that community in regard to their appointment in the public service ?

Mr. M. Govindan: My friend is not serious in putting that question and therefore I am not answering that. I have already pointed out that this complexity is uncalled for and unnecessary and needlessly hampers the administration of justice in the land. What I should propose is that in future we must have legislations for communities keeping in view the common interests of those communities so that one piece of legislation may affect the whole Travancoreans.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: One question, Sir.

Mr. M. Govindan: I do not yield. My friend Mr. Kottur who has been interrupting me.....

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Sir, on a point of order. May I know whether it is propor for an honourable member to say that a question put by another honourable member was not in serious. Is it in order, to attribute that another honourable member was not serious in putting a question ?

President: After all, on the question of the degree of seriousness which prompts an honourable member to put a question is not an easy one either for the Chair or for any other honourable member to ascertain.

Mr. M. Govindan: Sir, I did not say that he was not "in serious". But I said that the honourable member was not serious. My friend is imputing to me ungramatical observations. Sir, any piece of legislation that we attempt to place on the Statute Book must be in the direction of unifying the various sections and not with a view to perpetuate the existing differences. In Travancore most people who were following the system of Marumakkathayam have recently changed into Makkathayees Therefore a piece of legislation common to all the people of the State would be the proper thing for this House to attempt. But that may take some more time to bear fruition. Whatever that be, let us not proceed in the opposite direction and make special pieces of legislations for 20 or 30 families a piece. It is not proper to do so. I was just referring to my honourable friend Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai's Bill *viz.*, the Civil Marriages Bill.

President: The honourable member is now discussing a bill intended for the Marumakkathayee Krishnanvaka community. So he is not relevant to speak on any other bill.

Mr. M. Govindan: Sir, I am relevant in this way. My suggestion is that we must make legislations with a view to unify the different communities of the State.

President: The discussion is not wholly relevant because we are in the preliminary stage that is we are to consider whether the bill should be introduced or not. The honourable member may make up his mind not to go into minute details.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. Govindan : Sir, therefore I oppose this bill and say that it should not be referred to a Select Committee but should be thrown out by this House.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai (*Tovala* cum *Agastees-varam*) : Sir, in connection with this bill, I wish to make certain observations. Sir, this community known by the name of Krishnan-vaka Marumakkathayee community as stated by Mr. Easwara Pillai is a very small community. Almost all other communities who were following Marumakkathayam system, like the Nairs, Vellalas and the Ezhavas found that that system was a great obstacle to the moral and the material growth of the respective communities and so they have done away with it. Sir, it is a fundamental principle of jurisprudence that the laws governing societies must be flexible. As communities advance and progress, as ideas and sentiments of communities change, it is necessary that the social laws also must change in order to keep in conformity with the changing ideas and sentiments. So far as this community is concerned, there is a feeling that this Marumakkathayam system stands in the way of progress. Naturally there has been some agitation to do away with this system. So far as this Bill is concerned, I support the princi-ple to the extent that it attempts to do away with the Marumakka-thayam system.

Sir, certain things have to be borne in mind when enacting a new social measure. We shall have to keep in view the needs and aspirations of the community, the ideas and sentiments of the com-munity and, above all, in enacting such a measure, we, as respon-sible members of the Legislature have to see whether the proposed measure tends to the progress and the advancement of the commu-nity concerned. In the light of these things, if we examine the proposed measure, we find that the measure is wanting in many respects. Though I am in favour of a Bill for the community and I am in favour of doing away with the Marumakkathayam system obtaining in the community, yet I do not support the Bill as it is in its present form.

Sir, the Bill as it is, is a close copy of the Nair Regulation. As stated by Mr. Easwara Pillai, and I know it as a matter of fact, the Krishnanvaka Marumakkathayam community is a very small community, consisting of 1,000 and odd people. There was some difference of opinion in regard to the origin or the history of this community. As stated by my friend Mr. Easwara Pillai, this community consists of two sections and it is for one section of the community, namely the Marumakkathaya community that we are proposing this measure. But, as a matter of fact the two sections belong to the one community called the Krishnanvaka community. They trace their descent from a common ancestor and from a

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

common place. As a matter of fact, it is only one community. One section of the community following the Marumakkathayam law came earlier from Conjeevaram and because they had no women among them, they married local women and brought forth children and also adopted the Marumakkathayam system. Originally all the members of this community were following the Makkathayam system and the Marumakkathayam system was adopted by one section of the community only later on. In enacting a measure for this community we have to keep in view this aspect of the matter, namely, that these two sections belong to one and the same community and come from one and the same ancestor and that the Marumakkathayam system which one section is following was only a later adoption.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath : May I know from the honourable member whether on account of the fact that all humanity has descended from Adam and Eve, we should have only one law for all communities alike ?

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai : May I know from the honourable member who was that common ancestor ?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai : My point is this, Sir. These two sections belong to one community. They come from one place. Originally they came from Conjeevaram. That is how tradition goes. Of course it is all history and tradition and we have to believe in these things. Anyhow, one thing is clear. Originally they were following Makkathayam. But when one section came here earlier they adopted the Marumakkathayam system. That is my point.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath : What about their customs and manners ?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai : I shall refer to their customs and manners. Sir, as I submitted, the present Bill is a close copy of the Nair Regulation. As a matter of fact, I know that there is, among the younger generation in both the sections, a desire to have a fusion between the two sections and in my opinion such a fusion will certainly tend to their progress. It will add to their strength and their prestige. When the needs and aspirations of the people and when the desire of the people are for fusion, we should as far as possible try to amalgamate these two sections. As I said, they originally belonged to one community and that only subsequently they had to adopt this Marumakkathayam system. Now there is a desire among them for fusion. According to the present Bill proposed by Mr. Elenkath the provisions relating to marriage and other things stand as an obstacle to that fusion. For

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai]

example we shall take the provision relating to marriage. According to the provision in the Nair Regulation, a Nair woman can marry from outside her community. Similarly there is a provision in this Bill also which enables a woman belonging to the Krishnanvaka community to marry anyone from outside the community.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Is not an advantage to the women of the community to have such marriages legalised?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: Whether it is an advantage or a disadvantage depends upon the sense of the community and in enacting a social piece of legislation, it is not our individual opinion or ideas that ought to prevail. It is the ideas and sentiments, the wishes and the aspiration, of the communities concerned that ought to be respected and not our opinions, however valuable they may be and however cultured they may be. I know as a matter or fact that marriages of women outside the community are very rare. Further, such marriages are looked down upon by the members of that community. When that is the case, when you enact a measure enabling women to marry from outside the community, that is not only going against the sentiments and the wishes of the community but also preventing a fusion of the two sections for all time to come.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Are there not marriages of Krishnanvaka women with non-Krishnanvaka men even at present?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: I said that such marriages are very rare and that such marriages are looked down upon by that community in general. Therefore, my point is that in enacting such a measure, we should keep in view the sentiments of the community with regard to that matter.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Is there any obligatory clause in the present Bill that Krishnanvaka women should marry from outside their community?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: Under the proposed measure the women of the community are at liberty to marry from outside the community. It is in the first place against the sentiments and ideas of the community and in the second place it is a great obstacle to a fusion between the two sections which is the aspiration of the younger generation in both the sections.

Again, Sir, unless there is facility for intermarriages between the two sections, a fusion between the two sections is not possible under any circumstance. Therefore, such important provisions as this ought to be changed. It is our responsible duty to ascertain the wishes and sentiments of the community in general and to enact provisions in accordance with those wishes and sentiments.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Another point that I wish to mention is about the partition of tarwad properties. Following the Nair Regulation my honourable friend the mover has advocated division per capita. Sir, the opinion in the community is divided in this matter. As in the case of the Nair community, as in the case of the Vellala community and as in the case of the Ezhava community, there is a clear division of opinion in this community also on this matter. In the case of the Nairs the majority opinion was for division per capita and the Regulation was passed in accordance with the wishes of that community. In the case of the Vellalas the opinion was divided, and in the Legislature, as my friend Mr. Govindan lamented there was a very small minority, only one or two members; naturally the voice of the majority members prevailed and they adopted a *via media*, half per stirpes and half per capita. Here also as in the case of the communities following the Marumakkathayam system the opinion is divided as to whether partition should be per capita or per stirpes. In regard to that matter also the opinion of the majority has to be ascertained and partition has to be effected in accordance with the opinion of the majority.

Sir, some interested persons may be very anxious to rush through the Bill with the sole object of getting a division of the properties. But we, the responsible members of the Legislature ought to pay particular attention to the needs and aspirations of the people and the wishes of the community.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: May I know whether the honourable member can mention any one who wants to rush through the Bill with a view to have partition in his family?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: Sir, I am aware, but I do not want to state the name of the person before the House. What I submit to the House is that it is our duty, as responsible members of the Legislature, to ascertain the opinion of the various members of the community and to enact a measure in accordance with their desires and aspirations and their ideas and sentiments. In regard to the partition, as to whether it should be per stirpes or per capita, I forgot to mention one fact. Under the present condition of things, *i. e.* in the absence of any enactment, by agreement of parties, they have been dividing the tarwad properties and the principle followed in the matter of division has been per stirpes and not per capita. That is a strong evidence of the existing customs of division in the community. So, in view of these facts I do not think that per capita division advocated in the Bill will be approved by the majority of the people in the community.

Whatever that might be, it is our duty to ascertain the opinion of the majority and to act in accordance with their opinion,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. Govindan: May I know whether the member is proposing a roving commission to ascertain that matter ?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: No, Sir. My friend who has been long in the Legislature knows the method for ascertaining the opinion of the community in general. The Select Committee may call for the members of the community to depose before the committee itself. That is the usual method.

Mr. M. Govindan: May I know whether the member is opposing or supporting the affirmation of the principle of the Bill ?

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: My position is this. I am supporting the principle of the Bill in so far as it relates to the doing away of the Marumakkathayam law. I do not support the other provisions in the Bill. All that I suggest is that the wishes and aspirations of the community ought to be ascertained before enacting a measure for the community concerned.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Regarding the opinion of the community in general, may I know whether he advocates that method with regard to both the sections of the community.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai; We are not concerned with that section which is following Makkathayam law.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: Sir, I support the introduction of the bill. I do not propose to go into the history or the ethnology of the community or the description given in the Census Report. It is very clear that the members of that community want a piece of social legislation, a change in their personal law, rather a codification of their personal law with minor changes. It has been brought forward by a member representing the Kalkulam constituency and it has been supported by another learned friend, an eminent member who is also a representative of that constituency. I cannot understand why members of the other communities should be so anxious about fusion in law. I do not in fact understand the meaning of the word fusion. I am glad that it has some resemblence to some scientific term when the honourable member Mr. Kalkulam A. Easwara Pillai referred to fusion. But he said that there is nothing like inter-dining or inter-marriage in the communities. He appears to be a detached observer.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: May I know from the member.....

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I do not yield Sir. What I am saying is, but for the common accident of having the name of Krishnanvaka, there is nothing to make out that these communities are not different. My honourable friend Mr. Kalkulam A. Easwara Pillai, who is an expert in these matters

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

can speak with authority on matters concerning the Krishnanvaka community. I do not claim to speak with authority about the matter. But I am certainly sorry to observe that another honourable friend, whose strong point was his grammar, said that the community do not in fact deserve legislation because of the want of numerical strength. I am sorry that such an argument should have come from a person who, in time and out of time, dins into the ears of the House certain things, because of the strength of superior numbers. I would go to the extent of saying that even if there is only one man in the State who wants a personal law and for which there is no provision in the Statute Book, it is up to this House to make law for him. The fact that a community is too small is certainly no fault of the community. I leave it at that.

If I were a selfish member of such a community, I would have even prayed that that community should have the incentive to increase its members so as to come within the ambit of the Public Service Commissioner's rules after a period of some 10 or 15 years.

Mr. M. Govindan : On a point of order. Is it relevant for the member to speak about the Public Service Commissioner in this connection ?

President ; The honourable member was pointing out that fusion or assimilation of two communities may lead to extra, rather, increase of population, which may in turn lead to claims before a future Public Service Commissioner, who, if guided by the law of population, may have to yield to those claims.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi . Therefore, there is no point in saying that no legislation is required because the members of the community do not exceed 1500. Further, there has been no serious opposition to this Bill ever since it was published. That itself is a sure indication that the community wants such a measure. I do not say that the Bill as it is is perfect. I do not think that the mover of the Bill will claim that it is perfect. There is a definite procedure prescribed, as my honourable friend Mr. Arumukham Pillai suggested and that is, the Select Committee can indicate changes. It may give the Bill Krishnanvaka Makkathayee bias or Vellala bias or even Nair bias. Whether the Bill should be changed in accordance with the wishes of the community is a matter which could be taken up at the next stage. These are changes that could be made by the Select Committee to make the Bill an acceptable one to the community at large. If, as was suggested by one other honourable friend, the Select Committee, on taking evidence, finds any violent opposition from a certain section of the community, then we can think of dropping the Bill. At this stage, I support the introduction of the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: May I known, when there is no opposition to the measure, what is the necessity for evidence being taken?

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: From the opinions expressed on the floor of the House, I think that a certain amount of taking of evidence may be necessary.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: Sir, I rise to support the principle of the Bill. I am at a loss to find how we can question at this stage the necessity of this Bill. A Bill may be thrown out if the principle is not acceptable. But, some legislation was thought to be necessary by this House and that was the reason why 'leave to introduce' was granted. After having given that, I do not think it is possible for us to say that there is no necessity for this legislation.

Another point raised was regarding the question of fusion between two sections of the community. The opposition to this Bill is that it affects only a portion of a community numbering just above a thousand. There I may say this fact. The legislature here has passed a Bill for the Kshatriya community. They number only three thousand. Thereby, the principle accepted being that even a small minority can be given a legislation if that community desires it. If the circumstances of the community necessitate a codification of laws with regard to inheritance so as to make it definite and free from the ravages of litigation, I cannot see my way to oppose the principle of the Bill simply because, the numerical strength of the community is only a thousand. Whether this House has to go to the help of the community and bring about a legislation if it is found that such legislation is for the advancement of the community and if such a legislation is brought about by the desire of that community, my suggestion is that, the bill must be passed. If this Bill is not passed, where is the likelihood of fusion. I do not see any acceptable arguments being advanced to support that position. My friend Mr. Kalkulam A. Easwara Pillai who represents the Mukkathayee section which was the more numerous section of the community.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Sir, May I correct the member. I represent the Marumakkathayam section.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I thought he represented the Mekkathayee section of the community. Now he has said contrary to that. I am not very anxious about that.

With regard to the question of fusion, we find that this community has been in existence for a fairly long time. There has been no legislation passed as yet regarding any section of the community. Yet so much fusion has taken place in the community

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that even now there is neither inter-dining nor inter-marriage. That has been the result of having no legislation for this Marumakkathayam section. What is the proposal made by my friend Mr. Elenkath. The proposal is to approximate more closely with these people who follow the Mitakshara system in the Krishnanvaka community. The proposal is to give a Makkathayee bias for the Marumakkathayee section of the Krishnanvaka community. In that community, it has been stated that some interested people are anxious to get their share of the family property. How can that be not, a very undesirable desire? To have a portion of the family property to which he has a claim, is a legitimate desire. Instead of deprecating that, I say it is a legitimate grievance put before this House. There are a number of people in the community who are not able to get their legitimate share of maintenance. They are people who are merely called the owners of joint family properties but who do not enjoy them. The head of the family for the time being exploiting all others.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: Does the member know the number of partition suits pending before courts?

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I am not aware of that. But I am aware of the desire of the community to have partition effected so that, every member of the community may enjoy his legitimate share and that has been made out by the honourable member himself who opposed this legislation. I am not at all satisfied with the Bill as it is. I think drastic changes are necessary. When I say, I accept the principle of the Bill, I mean only this. A minority section of the Krishnanvaka community is in need of a legislation and that the legislation has to be made. The principle accepted so far as I am concerned is that there is necessity for a legislation of the kind. Ample freedom should be given to the Select Committee to make the necessary changes in the legislation proposed. The opinion of the community, as far as it is possible and consistent with the importance of the measure, should be ascertained before the final legislation is passed.

With these words, I support the principle of the Bill.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar: Sir, I support the principle of the Bill. The Bill was published in September last and clearly 10 months have elapsed since it was published. No protest has been heard from the members of that community, stating that such a piece of legislation is unwanted. The fact that the members of the community number only a few thousand is no reason for refusing legislation for the community if there is a real need for it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar.]

It has to be stated here that the Marumakkathayam system of law is beset with certain very serious difficulties in practice. Whenever cases arise under the system, custom and precedent's have to be depended upon. There are no written laws so far as custom is concerned. Courts find it very difficult to arrive at safe conclusions. So, to avoid all unnecessary complications, it is advisable to have a legislation. I suggest that it is desirable to have the status the rights and privileges of the members of this country well defined by a statute so that the community itself may know what all definite rights it has.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 1 P. M. and reassembled at 2 P. M. with the President in the Chair.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar: I think there is no reason for refusing legislation if there is a real necessity for it. Suppose a Taravad or a member of this community wants to execute a hypothecation. What are their powers and safeguards? Who all should join in the deed? What has the creditor to enquire? What are the safeguards? Now these have to be ascertained relying on customs. There is no written law. It depends upon several rulings of our courts which are in some cases inconsistent so much so that the members of this community find it very difficult to raise money for certain necessities. They have to undergo all kinds of risks. Properties have to be sold for lesser value. It is certainly a serious drawback. I think there should be definite laws. It is clear that there is necessity for such a legislation. When I say that, it should not be understood that I support all the provisions of the Bill. There are various sections, for instance, those with regard to partition, which I oppose. The right to partition given under the Nayar Regulation is said to have shattered many families. I support the principle of the Bill and am convinced of the necessity for such a legislation. With these words I support the principle of the Bill.

Mr P. R. Goda Varma Raja (*Eadavaga*): I also support the principle of the Bill. I do not quite agree with the argument brought forward by one of the honourable members that this legislation is detrimental to the fusion of the two divisions in the community. After all it is only by means of legislation that the law can be made definite and certain and it is to the advantage of the people and the members of the community concerned that the law should be so.

Coming to the point raised by Mr. Govindan that all communal laws should be scrapped. I am of the view that it is a Utopian idea. Under the present conditions it is not possible to abolish all communal legislation. Simply because the community

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

consists of only two or three thousand members, it is not right that a legislation should be denied to them. So far as the Krishnanvaka community is concerned, law is gathered from the customs and usages of the community. Almost all the major communities and even some of the minor communities have got special social laws passed by this Council. So it is not quite proper to deny any law to this community alone. If it is necessary to amend or modify the provisions of this Bill it may be made at the Select Committee stage and even when the Bill considered by this House. So far as the idea of fusion of the two divisions in the community is concerned, if the Bill is so modified as to make its provisions conform to the law applicable to that division of the community which follows the Makkathayam Law it is quite possible that the two divisions will be fused together so that they may form one community in law and custom. It is by social propaganda that fusion of communities is possible. We do now see before our eyes that sub-divisions of society are being gradually merged in one another and if we give them chance to organise and help them to educate so as to understand and realize their position it is quite easy to fuse them together. With these words I support the principle of the Bill.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: May I know whether it is the view of the member that fusion is possible if this Bill is passed.

Mr. P. R. Goda Varma Raja: Yes, quite possible.

Mr. Kalloor Narayana Pillai (*Mavelikara and Tiruvalla Cum Pattanamtitta*): സർ, ഈ ബില്ലിന്റെ തത്വത്തോട് ഞാൻ യോജിക്കുന്നു. അതോടുകൂടി ഈ ബില്ലിന്റെ ആവശ്യകത എത്രമാത്രമുണ്ടെന്നു ഈ കൌൺസിലിനെ ബോദ്ധ്യപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നും ഞാൻ ആശിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ഒന്നാമതായി കൃഷ്ണർവക മരുമക്കത്തായക്കാരുടെ വിവാഹബന്ധത്തെ ശാശ്വതമായ നിയമശാസനത്താൽ ഉറപ്പിക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടില്ല എന്നുള്ള ദൃഷ്യത്തെ പരിഹരിക്കുന്നതിനു ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു നിയമം ഏറ്റവും അത്യാവശ്യമാകുന്നു. ഒരു ഭർത്താവു് ഒരു ഭാര്യയെ—കുട്ടികളുള്ള ഭാര്യയെ—ഉപേക്ഷിക്കുക എന്നു വന്നാൽ അതിലേക്കു ഒരു ശരിയായ പരിഹാരം കൽപ്പിച്ചില്ലെങ്കിൽ അതു സ്ത്രീലോകത്തിന്റെ അഭിമാനത്തെ സാരമായി ബാധിക്കുന്നതിനും തന്നിമിത്തം അവർക്കു കഷ്ടതകരം അനുഭവിക്കുന്നതിനും ഇടയാകുന്നതാണു്. അതിനാൽ ഒരു നിയമശാസനത്താൽ വിവാഹബന്ധം ഉറപ്പിക്കേണ്ടതു ഏറ്റവും അത്യാവശ്യമായിത്തീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. രണ്ടാമതായി ഈ ബില്ലിൽ കാണുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതി സന്തോ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

സമ്പാദിച്ചശേഷം മരിച്ചുപോകുന്ന ഒരു ജൂനിയർ മെമ്പരുടെ സ്വത്തിന്മേലുള്ള അവകാശം അയാളുടെ ഭാര്യയ്ക്കും മക്കൾക്കും സ്ഥാപിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുകയെന്നുള്ളതാണ്. ഇത് ഒരു നിയമശാസനംകൊണ്ടേ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. ഇന്നത്തെ സ്ഥിതിക്കു ഒരു തറവാട്ടിലെ ഒരുജൂനിയർമെംബരുടെ സ്വത്തിന്മേലുള്ള അവകാശം കുടുംബത്തിലേക്കു ലയിക്കുകയല്ലാതെ ഭാര്യയ്ക്കും മക്കൾക്കും കിട്ടുന്നില്ല. ഈ അവസ്ഥ പരിഹരിക്കേണ്ടതും അത്യാവശ്യമാകുന്നു. മൂന്നാമതായി ഭാഗത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചാണു ഇതിൽ പറയുന്നത്. കുടുംബസ്വത്തു കൈവശം വച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഒരു കാരണവൻ എപ്പോഴും ആളോഹരിഭാഗത്തിനു എതിരായിട്ടേ നിൽക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. അംഗങ്ങൾ ഭാഗം ആവശ്യപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ അതു കൊടുക്കാനുള്ള മടികൊണ്ടു കുടുംബവ്യാഹംപോലും ചെയ്യാൻ കാരണമായിത്തീരുന്നു. അതിനാൽ ഭാഗത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചും ഈ ബില്ലിലെ വ്യവസ്ഥകൾ അത്യാവശ്യമാണെന്നു പറയാതെ തരമില്ല.

ഈ സമുദായത്തിൽ ജനസംഖ്യ വളരെ കുറവായിട്ടേയുള്ളൂ എന്നുള്ളതാണു മറ്റൊരാക്ഷേപം ഇവിടെ പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. മക്കത്തായി കൃഷ്ണൻവകക്കാരുടെയിടയിൽ ഉള്ള ജനസംഖ്യ പതിനായിരത്തോളം ഉണ്ടെന്നും, മരുമക്കത്തായി കൃഷ്ണൻവകക്കാരുടെ ജനസംഖ്യ ആയിരത്തോളം മാത്രമേയുള്ളുവെന്നും ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിക്കയുണ്ടായി ഇതു തീരെ ക്ഷയിച്ചുവരുന്ന സമുദായമാണെങ്കിൽ ഈ ആയിരം പേർതന്നെ ശേഷിക്കയില്ലായിരുന്നു. ഇപ്പോൾത്തന്നെ ആയിരത്തിൽപരം ജനസംഖ്യയുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ സമുദായം വർദ്ധിച്ചുവരുന്നു എന്നേ വിചാരിക്കാൻ തരമുള്ളൂ. മക്കത്തായികളും മരുമക്കത്തായികളുമായ കൃഷ്ണൻവക സമുദായക്കാരുടെ ഇടയിൽ ഈ ബില്ലുനിമിത്തം ഭിന്നിപ്പുണ്ടാകും എന്നുള്ള സംശയംതന്നെ അസ്ഥാനത്തിലാണ്. ഈ ബിൽ പാസ്സായി ആളോഹരിഭാഗംവച്ചു അച്ഛന്റെ സ്വത്തു മക്കൾക്കു കിട്ടുമ്പോഴും മക്കത്തായത്തിലേക്കുള്ള വാസന അവർക്കും ക്രമേണ ഉണ്ടാകും. ഇപ്പോൾ മക്കത്തായവിരോധികളെന്നു കാണുന്നവരെ കാലാന്തരത്തിൽ മക്കത്തായാനുകൂലികളാക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. അങ്ങിനെ രണ്ടുവർഗ്ഗവും തമ്മിൽ ചേരുന്നതിനും ഈ ബില്ലു ഉപകരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: May I know whether inter-marriges are possible in view of the provisions regulating this Bill?

Mr. Kalloor Narayana Pillai : ഇൻറർ മാരിയേജും ഇൻറർ ഡൈനിംഗും അനേകകാലമായി ഈ സമുദായത്തിൽ നടപ്പില്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു മേലാൽ ഇതു നടപ്പിൽ വരുമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കാൻ തര

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

മില്ല. ഇവിടെ അവരെ യോജിപ്പിച്ചു കൊണ്ടുപോകണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് ഉദ്ദേശം.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai : May I know how the member knows that there is no inter-marriages between the two communities?

Mr. Kalloor Narayana Pillai : മി. ഈശ്വരപിള്ള പ്രസ്താവിച്ചതിൽനിന്നും ഞാൻ മനസ്സിലാക്കിയതാണ്.

ഈ സമുദായം ഏതു പൂർവീകന്മാരിൽനിന്നും പിരിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നു ഇവിടെ നോക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണന്റെ സന്താനങ്ങളെല്ലാം നമ്മുടെ പുരാണപ്രകാരം നശിച്ചുപോയിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു കൃഷ്ണൻവകക്കാർ ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണന്റെ സന്താനവഴിയിലുള്ളവരാണെന്നുപറയാൻ തരമില്ല. ഒരു പക്ഷേ ഭഗവദ്ഭക്തന്മാരായിരുന്ന കുറെ ആളുകൾ അയിരിക്കും ഇവർ. ഈ സമുദായംതന്നെ പൂർവീകർമ്മ മരുമക്കവഴിക്കാരായിരുന്നിരിക്കണം. അവരിൽ ചിലർ ഇവിടെ വന്നു ഇവിടത്തെ മക്കത്തായസ്ത്രീകളുമായി വിവാഹബന്ധത്തിലേർപ്പെട്ടതുനിമിത്തം മക്കത്തായക്കാരായിട്ടു പിരിഞ്ഞതായിരിക്കണം. ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻതന്നെ മരുമക്കവഴിക്കാരനായിരുന്നില്ലേ എന്നാണു ഞാൻ സംശയിക്കുന്നതു്. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ കംസനെ വധിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യം വരികയില്ലായിരുന്നു. ഏതായാലും അവരുടെ പുരാതന ദായക്രമം അനുസരിച്ചു ഒരു ബിൽ ആവശ്യമാണെന്നാണെന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

Mr. V. S. Arumukham Pillai: May I know whether the member is aware that the original inhabitants came from outside?

Mr. Kalloor Narayana Pillai: ഇങ്ങോട്ടിൽ നിന്നുംപോന്നിട്ടുള്ളവരാണെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു്.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: I wish to speak a few words in reply to the criticisms raised by certain members against the principle of the Bill. I am glad that no very serious objection has been taken by honourable members. The only objection is that this Bill if passed, may even tend to make a cleavage between the Makkathayam and Marumakkathayam Sections of the Krishnanvaka community. I am surprised how one can argue in that manner when we find that the very object of the Bill, as has been observed by various members, is to create a Makkathayam bias in place of the Marumakkathayam Law which the community is now following. Whether a fusion is required or necessary is a question which I cannot answer now. Whether Mr. Easwara Pillai has behind him

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the consolidated opinion of the Marumakkathayam Section of the community is a question which I am not quite sure of. A question was put whether a Makkathayam member can legitimately represent the Marumakathayam Section of the community. I understand that all educated people of the community are in support of the principle of the Bill and it was with great difficulty that Government was able to find out a man who opposes the Bill to be represented in this House. There are graduates and graduates-in-law who support the principle of the Bill. All these people have unitedly approached the Government with memorials. So it is not a hasty legislation that we are endeavouring to launch upon.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: May I know whether the persons referred to by the member all belong to one particular family ?

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: They belong to the Marumakkathayam section of the community and all the educated members of that section are in support of this legislation.

Mr. Kochikkal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: If an honourable member who is a Nair can sponsor such a Bill, why not another honourable member who belong to the Makkathayee section of the Krishnanvaka community sponsor a Bill for the Marumakkathayee section of that community ?

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: We, as members of this House are entitled to bring forward any legislation affecting any community. The Division Peishkar went to the spot, made enquiries and submitted a report and with reference to that.....

President: Order, order. It should not be taken from that letter that in regard to social legislations, Government will force any views upon the House. They propose to take a neutral attitude so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: My object in reading out this was to show that this was not a hasty step taken by me but the community has already moved in the matter.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: May I know whether the whole of the Marumakkathayee section of the community supports the Bill or only a portion of it ?

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: A large majority of them demand such a legislation. And even in the case of taking a referendum it is not very difficult because the members of that section of the community number on the whole 1,385 only. This is the latest figure. The adults will certainly be less than a thousand. Therefore it is not very difficult to take evidence or a referendum if the Select Committee visits about three places in South Travancore *viz.*, Eraniel, Thuckalai and Manavalakurichi. With regard to one

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

argument raised by Mr. Govindan and well answered by Mr. Thampi, that is, even though the number of a certain community is very small, if there is a need for legislation with reference to that community then certainly we must see that such legislation is passed. But I should also say that if there is only one person who is legitimately suffering for want of a social legislation that person should not be denied the right of having a special legislation for him. Sir, this community is closely allied in manners and customs to the Nair community and why should this legislation which may give them additional privileges be denied to them. With these words, I leave the Bill for the consideration of the House.

The motion that this Bill be read in Council was put to vote and carried.

Secretary: The Title of the bill shall be "THE TRAVANCORE KRISHNANVAKA MARUMAKKATHAYAM BILL".

Mr. K. R. Elenkath: Sir, I move that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members:—

1. Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai.
2. ,, G. Narayana Aiyar.
3. ,, Kalloor Narayana Pillai.
4. ,, M. K. Ananthasiva Aiyar.
5. ,, V. S. Arumukham Pillai.
6. ,, James Fletcher.
7. ,, P. R. Godavarma Raja.
8. ,, K. K. Kuruvila.
9. ,, Kochikkal P. Balakrishnan Tampi.
10. ,, Nedumangad R. Kesavan Nair.
11. ,, M. Govindan.
12. ,, T. Mahomed Ismail.
13. ,, K. M. Korah.
14. ,, Padiyara Joseph Kunju.
15. Mrs. Abernam Gnanasikhamony.
16. Mr. M. S. Anirudhan.
17. ,, A. Easwara Pillai. (co-opted.)
18. ,, Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai.
19. ,, K. R. Elenkath.

Mr. M. S. Anirudhan: I second the motion.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I thought of proposing an amendment to include no members who oppose the Bill.

President: The honourable member is at liberty to move any amendment. I do not like to create an impression in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly